

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 remain pending in the application and were examined in the most recent action. Claims 10 and 11 are newly added. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

#### **Amendments to the Specification**

The specification is amended at several instances to change the term “wide disk” to simply “disk” as a storage media. The term disk is well known and understood as a storage media, and it is clear from the specification that the embodiments are referencing a storage media. As such, the amendments do not add any new matter, and entry of the same is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-9 are rejected in the action as being unpatentable in view of Dejeager et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As set forth in amended claim 1 and new claim 10, a system includes, among other things, at least two advertising monitors. A first of the monitors is a moving image advertising monitor. A second of the monitors is a text advertising monitor. The first monitor displays moving images from a server through a communication network. The second monitor displays advertising information stored in a disk. That is, in an embodiment of the present invention, moving advertising received from the server is displayed on a first monitor while advertising information stored in a disk is displayed on a second monitor. Further, the disk driver displays the advertising information displayed on the second monitor simultaneously on the first monitor if communication between a terminal system and the server is someone interrupted, see, e.g., claims 5 and 11.

Dejeager cannot anticipate or render the claims unpatentable because Dejeager fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation set forth in the claims. Specifically, Dejeager fail to teach and suggest multiple monitors. In fact, Dejeager teaches only a single monitor. Thus, Dejeager cannot and does not teach or suggest a first, moving advertising

monitor and a second, advertising information monitor. Dejeager further fails to teach or suggest simultaneous display of advertising information from a disk drive on the first monitor and the second monitor.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Dejeager et al. It follows also that claims 2-9 and 11 are allowable based upon their dependence from claims 1 or 10, as the case may be, and on their own merits.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony G Sitko, 36278/  
Anthony G. Sitko  
Registration No.: 36,278  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300  
Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300  
Attorney for Applicant